

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 16-18, 27 and 29-30 are amended for clarity.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-15, 18-21 and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,629,134 to Hayward et al. (hereafter Hayward). The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 16, 22-30, 32 and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward in view of U.S. Patent 6,757,837 to Platt et al. (hereafter Platt). The Office Action further rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward in view of JP 06008594 to Kaneko. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a television (TV) that includes a storing unit and a controlling unit. The storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site. Independent claim 1 also recites the controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Hayward relates to a computer system having computer peripherals in which a peripheral condition may be determined and sent by firmware 16 over bus 32 to a computer 30. The Office Action (on page 3) states that Hayward does not disclose a television in communication with a computer system. The Office Action then states that a TV card was a well-known computer peripheral device that can be added to a computer.

Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office to provide a prior art reference that discloses the alleged TV card and to show proper motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art reference with Haywood. See MPEP §2144.03.

Independent claim 1 specifically recites a television (as stated in the preamble) that includes a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV and a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information. Accordingly, features of the claimed television are provided throughout independent claim 1. These features may not be ignored.

The Office Action's combination of Hayward's computer system with a TV card is clearly based on impermissible hindsight. Further, the alleged combination still does not suggest the features of the claimed television as Hayward and the alleged TV card do not teach or suggest the claimed features. As one example, a computer system and the alleged TV card do not suggest a television having a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV and a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV. The Office Action does not specifically address the claim 1 limitations regarding the TV other than to state that a TV card allows the computer to act like a television.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to

combine reference teachings. Third, there must be a reasonable expectation of success for the modification or combination of references. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. See MPEP §2143 and *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayward and the alleged TV card (if properly provided in a prior art reference) do not teach or suggest all the claimed features, and therefore the Patent Office fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. More specifically, independent claim 1 recites a television that includes a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site. Hayward and the alleged TV card (assuming the Patent Office can provide a proper prior art reference) do not teach or suggest these features as there is no discussion regarding a television having the claimed storing unit and/or the storing unit for storing proper information of the TV. Even if the combination is made, the combination still does not store proper information of the TV (as claimed). Applicants further submit that the features of the claimed television (at the time of the invention) differ from a computer system. The modification of a computer system does not correspond to the claimed television. Further, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would not have considered Hayward's computer system (with a TV card) to be the claimed television.

Additionally, independent claim 1 recites a television including a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV

and the contact information. Hayward and the alleged TV card (assuming the Patent Office can provide a proper prior art reference) do not teach or suggest these features as there is no discussion regarding a television having the claimed controlling unit and/or an error checkup menu of the TV. Even if the combination is made, the combination still does not relate to an error checkup menu of the TV. For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites a control method of a television (TV) that includes transmitting proper information of the TV to a certain site, and receiving, at the TV, service menu information corresponding to the TV. Independent claim 10 also recites selecting information from the received service menu information at the TV, and receiving, at the TV, the selected information from the service menu information. Independent claim 10 also recites displaying the selected information on the screen of the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Hayward and the alleged TV card (assuming the Patent Office can provide a proper prior art reference) do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Even more specifically, there is no suggestion for displaying the selected information on the screen of the TV. Additionally, the Office Action (on page 4) cites Hayward's col. 6, lines 70-74 and col. 7, lines 48-51 as teaching the claimed "selecting information." However, the cited sections relate to a computer system and not to a TV. Thus, even if the combination is made, the combination still does not relate to the specific information of the TV and/or the other features regarding the TV. For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 27 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 27 recites a television that includes a television storing unit to store information of the television. Independent claim 27 also recites a television that includes a television controlling unit to transmit the stored information and error information of the television to an Internet site, the television controlling unit to receive error information based on the transmitted error information, and the television controlling unit to automatically apply the received error information so as to restore the error of the television.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. Platt does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 27. More specifically, Platt does not suggest a television controlling unit to automatically apply the received error information so as to restore the error of the television. Platt and Hayward do not relate to errors of a television. Therefore, even if Platt is combined with Hayward, there still is no teaching or suggestion of restoring an error of a television. The Office Action also has not provided a proper combination to suggest automatically restoring errors of a television (based on received error information). Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 31 recites receiving a signal requesting information about a television and transmitting a model name or a model number of the television from a television to a particular web site based on the received signal, the particular site and the model name or the model number being previously stored in the television. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim

31. Further, the alleged combination does not teach or suggest transmitting a model name or model number of the television from a television to a website based on a received signal. That is, the Office Action's modification of a computer system does not correspond to the claimed features relating to a television such as a model name or a model number of a television. Accordingly, independent claim 31 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10, 27 and 31 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, dependent claim 2 recites that the controlling unit automatically restores an error of the TV based on received information. See also dependent claims 15, 22, 23, 25 and 37-38. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features. That is, Platt does not suggest to restore an error of the TV based on received information. Platt and Hayward do not relate to errors of a TV and therefore do not relate to automatically restoring an error of a TV. Thus, dependent claim 2 (and similarly dependent claims 15, 22, 23, 25 and 37-38) define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

Additionally, dependent claim 32 recites that the signal is received from a television remote control. The applied references do not teach or suggest this specific feature. The Office Action's citation of a "show me" button does not correspond to a television remote control. Thus, dependent claim 32 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Serial No. 09/842,082
Reply to Office Action dated June 2, 2006


Docket No. P-0222

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-38 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: July 25, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610